

REMARKS

Special Status

Applicant draws attention to the pendency of this application, which is now greater than five years. Accordingly, under MPEP 708.01(I), this application is now entitled to "special" status.

Section 102 rejection of claim 1

*Mondrosch*¹ discloses a pager for receiving messages over the telephone network. As best understood, the Examiner regards locations in the pager's memory 122 as corresponding to the message slots recited in claim 1. Applicant therefore assumes that the Examiner regards the placement of a new message inside any one of these locations in memory 122 as meeting claim 1's first two limitations, namely "selecting a new-message slot" and "placing [a] message in said new-message slot."

However, *Mondrosch* fails to disclose the remaining limitation of

"modifying said new-message slot to specify an intended recipient"

This is not surprising because a message that arrives at the pager has *already reached* its intended recipient. Thus, there would be no reason to modify anything in the memory 122 "to specify an intended recipient."

In addition, claim 1 requires that the message list be "accessible to a plurality of processors" and that the intended recipient be "selected from said plurality of processors." In *Mondrosch*, there is only one processor 112 that can access the memory 122.

In contrast, Applicant discloses a message list that is accessible to several processors. Under these circumstances, it makes sense to "specify an intended recipient" of the message. Doing so ensures that each processor will retrieve only its own messages.

No such problem arises in *Mondrosch* because there is no processor other than processor 112 that can retrieve messages from the memory 122. Hence, there is no possibility that the

¹ *Mondrosch*, U.S. Patent No. 5,379,031.

processor 112 will pick up messages intended for another processor, as there is in Applicant's system.

It is apparent therefore that *Mondrosch* fails to teach each limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, the section 102 rejection is improper.

The remaining claims are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1.

Section 102 rejection of claim 2

Claim 2 recites the additional limitation of a

"message list including a first existing-message slot having a pointer to a second existing-message slot"

The Examiner appears to regard the hierarchical list 127 described in col. 4, lines 20-24 and lines 46-50 as containing the pointer recited in claim 2.

Consistent with the Examiner's interpretation of claim 1, the claimed "message slot" would have to correspond to the individual memory 126 because it is here that the messages are stored. The list 127, however, is distinct from the memory 126. Thus, in *Mondrosch*, any pointers stored in the list 127 would be stored *outside* the memory 126.

Claim 2 requires that the message slot *itself* store the pointer to another message slot. This is inconsistent with the disclosure of *Mondrosch*, in which pointers are stored in a list 127 *separate* from the location that contains the messages.

Accordingly, in addition to being patentable for reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, claim 2 is also patentable because the cited art fails to teach the additional limitation of claim 2.

Section 102 rejection of claim 3

Claim 3 recites the additional limitation of

"setting a first pointer on said new-message slot to point to said first existing-message slot and a second pointer on said new-message slot to point to said second existing message-slot"

The Examiner draws attention to col. 5, lines 40-49 as disclosing this limitation.

The cited text merely states that when an existing message has been read, it can be overwritten. When this occurs, information in the list **129** that corresponds to the overwritten memory location is altered.

However, the cited passage does not appear to describe any operation that manipulates pointers associated with *two* different message-slots. Accordingly, the cited passage contains no reference to first *and* second pointers as recited in claim 3.

Accordingly, in addition to being patentable for reasons discussed in connection with its parent claims, claim 3 is also patentable because the cited art fails to teach the additional limitation of claim 3.

Section 102 rejection of claim 5

Claim 5 recites the additional limitation of

“modifying a destination mask associated with said new-message slot”

The Examiner draws attention to col. 3, lines 23-30 as teaching this limitation. The cited passage refers to the examination of certain addresses that have been stored in a nonvolatile memory **110**.

In the first place, a destination mask is different from a list of addresses. A destination mask typically includes a sequence of bits (or other elements) that correspond to addresses. These bits are not themselves addresses.

Secondly, the nonvolatile memory **110** is distinct from the memory **122**. Therefore, any address information contained in the nonvolatile memory **110** cannot be “associated with said new-message slot” as required in claim 5.

Third, the operation described in the cited passage appears to involve *inspecting* an address. There is no “modifying” of any address information within the volatile memory **110**. Hence, there can be no “modifying a destination mask” as recited in claim 5.

Fourth, address information contained in the non-volatile memory 110 identifies different pagers. It is therefore not “associated with said new-message slot” as required by claim 5.

Accordingly, in addition to being patentable for reasons discussed in connection with its parent claims, claim 5 is also patentable because the cited art fails to teach the additional limitation of claim 5.

Section 102 rejection of claim 6

Claim 6 recites the additional limitations of

“selecting, from a plurality of constituent data-elements of said destination mask, each of said constituent data-elements corresponding to one of said processors from said plurality of processors, a selected data-element corresponding to a selected processor; and

modifying said selected data-element to indicate that said selected processor is an intended recipient.”

The Examiner draws attention to column 3, lines 23-30 as disclosing the “selecting” step and column 4, lines 18-25 as disclosing the “modifying” step.

The first of these two passages describes an operation involving data in non-volatile memory 110. Thus, the “selected data-element” recited in the claim would have to be found in the non-volatile memory 110. However, according to the second passage, the “modifying” step is an operation involving data in the list 127, which is in a completely different memory, namely memory 122.

The proposed correspondence thus makes no sense. Unless the selected data-element “is somehow in two places at once, or unless it was somehow moved, it cannot be selected in the non-volatile memory 110 and then modified in the message memory 122.

Moreover, the data in the list 127 does not “indicate that said selected processor is an intended recipient.” After all, if the processor 112 was not already a selected recipient, the message would never have reached the message memory 122. Hence, any modification of data in the list 127 would be inconsistent with the “modifying” step of claim 6.

Accordingly, in addition to being patentable for reasons discussed in connection with its parent claims, claim 6 is also patentable because the cited art fails to teach the additional limitation of claim 6.

Section 102 rejection of claim 7

Claim 7 recites the additional limitation of

“updating a message directory to indicate the presence of said new-message slot in said message list, said message directory being accessible to said plurality of processors.”

The Examiner draws attention to column 6, lines 49-55 as disclosing this limitation.

As best understood from the cited passage and its surrounding text, the Examiner regards the list 127 as corresponding to the message directory recited in claim 7.

However, the list 127 is not “accessible to [a] plurality of processors” as recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, in addition to being patentable for reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, claim 7 is also patentable because the cited art fails to teach the additional limitation of claim 7.

Section 102 rejection of claim 8

Claim 8 recites the additional limitation of

“updating an attention mask containing information indicative of which processors from said plurality of processors are intended recipients of messages contained in said message list.”

The Examiner draws attention to col. 5, lines 7-17 as teaching this additional limitation.

It is not clear from this passage what the Examiner regards as an “attention mask.” Applicant speculates that the Examiner may be considering the list 127 to be an attention mask. If this is the case, then the list 127 is apparently capable of many guises. In rejecting claim 2, the Examiner suggested that list 127 contained pointers; in rejecting with claim 7, the list 127 was a “message directory”; then in rejecting claim 6, the list 127 became a “destination mask.” Finally, in what appears to be its last incarnation, the list 127 has now become an “attention mask.”

According to col. 4, lines 21-25, the list 127 contains *message* identifiers. Therefore it does not contain "information indicative of which processors...are intended recipients of messages contained in" the message list. Thus, any updating of the list 127 would be inconsistent with the "updating" step of claim 8.

Moreover, it would make no sense for the list 127 to contain such information indicative of an intended recipient. After all, a message only reaches the pager in the first place if the processor 112 is an intended recipient.

Summary

Now pending in this application are claims 1-9, of which claim 1 is independent.

That Applicant has argued only certain grounds for patentability is not meant as an admission that no other grounds for patentability exist, either for those claims specifically discussed, or those claims that were not discussed.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket "07072-127001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 23, 2006



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21293584.doc